



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ



3 2106 01931 9067

THE COLLEGE CLASSICAL STUDIES

11

JUNE, 1922

The Case-Construction After the Comparative in Pliny's Letters

BY

GIFFORD FOSTER CLARK, A.M.,
Professor of Smith College

EDITORS

CHARLES H. BEARDS

JOHN HARWOOD CLARK

AMERICAN CLASSICAL SOCIETY

1922

The Collegiate Press
GEORGE BANTA PUBLISHING COMPANY
MENASHA, WIS.

SMITH COLLEGE CLASSICAL STUDIES

Number III

June, 1922

**The Case-Construction After the
Comparative in Pliny's Letters**

BY

GIFFORD FOSTER CLARK, A.M.
Registrar of Smith College

EDITORS

JOHN EVERETT BRADY

JULIA HARWOOD CAVERNO

NORTHAMPTON, MASSACHUSETTS

1922

The Smith College Classical Studies are published from time to time by the Departments of Greek and Latin of Smith College and have for their main object the encouragement of research in classical literature, archaeology, and antiquities by providing an opportunity for the publication of studies in these fields by scholars connected with Smith College, as teachers, graduate students, or alumnae. Contributions of studies in these fields of research will be welcomed by the editors, John Everett Brady and Julia Harwood Caverno, and may be addressed to either one of them. All business communications as to purchase of copies, requests for exchanges, etc., should be addressed to Miss Mary Dunham, Librarian of Smith College, Northampton, Mass. The price of single numbers is seventy-five cents.

SMITH COLLEGE CLASSICAL STUDIES

Number 1. "Hellenistic Influence on the Aeneid," by Eleanor Shipley Duckett, June, 1920.

Number 2. "A Study in the Commerce of Latium From the Early Iron Age through the Sixth Century, B. C.," by Louise E. W. Adams, April, 1921.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction	VII
Comparison instituted with a nominative	1
Comparison instituted with a genitive	1
Comparison instituted with a dative	2
Comparison instituted with an accusative	3
Comparison instituted with an ablative	5
One member of the comparison modified	6
Comparative adjective modified by a dative	8
Comparison between adjectives modifying the same noun ..	9
Adjectives compared by means of <i>magis</i>	9
Comparative modified by an ablative of degree of difference	10
Construction after the comparative in subjunctive clauses ..	10
Comparative as modifier of a subject infinitive	12
Construction after the comparative expressing genitive of price	12
Comparative adjective agreeing with a nominative as first term of the comparison	12
Universal negatives	14
Rhetorical questions	16
Proverbial expressions	17
<i>Solito</i> after the comparative	17
<i>Plus, minus, longius, amplius</i>	18
General adverbs	20
Conclusions	24

INTRODUCTION

In the Cornell Studies in Classical Philology,¹ Volume XV, K. P. R. Neville has made a study of the case-construction after the comparative in Latin, carrying his investigation through the period of Republican Literature. His work has resulted in the deduction of certain principles for the construction during that period.

The present work aims to carry the investigation into the period of Silver Latin through a study of the use with the comparative in the Letters of Pliny the Younger, and to point out in what particulars Pliny adheres to or departs from the usage of the Republican Period. As the Panegyric has not been treated in this work, all references to Pliny are taken from the Letters. It might be expected that the influence of the epistolary style would contribute somewhat to the development of certain usages, but the restrained character of the Letters eliminates much of the colloquial freedom common to this type of literature.

For the most part, I have followed Neville's arrangement of categories, noting the points where I have differed from his plan. In a number of cases I have cited the same examples under more than one category wherever there seemed to be various influences upon the construction, and in each case I have indicated the other categories where the reference might be found.

The scope of the work does not include examples where the second member of the comparison is formed by verbs, infinitives, or adverbs, except where the conspicuous reoccurrence of some form made the construction noteworthy. In so many cases the comparison of the adjective was formed by the use of *non minus* that it seemed best to incorporate all such instances in the regular categories in place of trying to classify them by themselves.

The citations are in general made from the Teubner Text of the works of Pliny the Younger, (Ed. Henricus Keil, Leipz.

¹ Macmillan Company, 1901.

1896). Where I have introduced variant readings, I have cited the source of each. The illustrations from Republican Literature, which I have incorporated for purposes of comparison, I have taken directly from Neville's work. I wish here to express my indebtedness to Professor Mary Belle McElwain of Smith College whose advice and assistance during the investigation of this subject have been invaluable.

CATEGORIES OF CONSTRUCTIONS

I.

The comparison is instituted with a nominative:

A.

The adjective agrees with some noun in the genitive, dative, or ablative; *quam* with the nominative *always* follows.

VI, 2, 6: quia paucioribus clepsydris praecipitamus causas quam diebus explicari solebant. In this case the "we" and "they" which are compared are expressed in the verb. (See Category V.)

B.

The first noun of the comparison is in the nominative case, while the comparative adjective is in the accusative in agreement with some other noun. *Quam* is *always* used to effect the comparison and the nominative follows it.

II, 20, 12: non minora praemia, immo maiora, nequitia et improbitas quam pudor et virtus habent.

V, 6, 30: cubiculum cui non minus iucundum prospectum cryptoporticus ipsa quam vineae praebent.

V, 17, 5: qui ex auditorio illo non minorem pietatis gloriam quam ille alter eloquentiae tulit. (See Category II, A.)

VII, 9, 10: sed hi lusus non minorem interdum gloriam quam seria consequuntur.

II.

The comparison is instituted with a genitive; *quam* with a genitive *always* follows. In this category, as Neville notes (p. 8), it makes no difference in what case the comparative adjective is; the form of expression is always the same.

A.

V, 17, 5: qui ex auditorio illo non minorem pietatis gloriam quam ille alter eloquentiae tulit. (See Category I, B.)

VII, 17, 5: cur minus probabilis sit causa recitandi quam edendi? (See Category XI.)

B.

It is noteworthy that, whereas in Republican Literature a large percentage of genitives are "genitives of the whole", in Pliny's Letters no examples occur which illustrate this usage. In the only case where the partitive genitive is found with *plus*, the comparison is not instituted with the genitive, but lies rather between the verbal ideas expressed and implied.

III, 12, 3: potuitne plus auctoritatis tribui Catoni quam si ebrius quoque tam venerabilis erat?

C.

Only one example is found in the Letters which approaches the usage of the Republican Period, where an adjective takes the place of one of the genitives. This reference is not exactly comparable to the examples cited by Neville inasmuch as the adjective and the genitive do not modify the same word.

II, 11, 14: coepi dicere non minore audientium adsensu quam sollicitudine mea. (See Categories V; VI, B and C.)

III.

The comparison is instituted with a preceding dative; *quam* with the dative usually follows in Republican Literature. In Pliny *quam* with the dative *always* occurs. The comparative adjective is found in any case.

III, 20, 10: cuius materiae nobis quanto rarior quam veteribus occasio tanto minus omittenda est. (See Category X.)

In this case the comparative adjective is modified by the ablative of degree of difference, which puts the example also under Category X., a class which, in the examples drawn from Pliny, allows either the ablative or *quam*.

IV, 7, 3: quamquam minor vis bonis quam malis inest.

VI, 16, 20: habitus corporis quiescenti quam defuncto similior.

VIII, 20, 10: haec tibi scripsi quia nec minus ignota quam mihi, nec minus grata credebam.

IX, 10, 3: id genus operis inamabile, inamoenum, magisque laboribus ruris quam voluptatibus simile. (See Categories VI, B; IX.) Here the first element of the comparison is modified by a genitive, and in Pliny this construction is more likely to be followed by an ablative. (Category VI, B). But on the other hand, the comparative is formed by the use

of *magis*, which in Pliny takes *quam*. (Category IX.)
 IX, 26, 2: frequentior currentibus quam reptantibus lapsus.

IV.

The comparison is instituted with an accusative:

A.

No examples are found in the Letters where the comparative is in an oblique case other than the accusative.

B.

The comparison is effected by a comparative in the accusative case:

(1) If the accusative which institutes the comparison is the subject of an infinitive,

(a) In affirmative sentences, the comparative is *usually* followed by *quam* in Republican Literature, *always* in Pliny. VI, 11, 4: peto ut omnis qui me imitari tanti putabunt meliores esse quam me velint. (See Category XI.)

III, 5, 20: confido tamen haec quoque tibi non minus grata quam ipsos libros futura.

(b) In negative sentences under the same conditions the ablative appears regularly, though not invariably, in Republican Literature but no instance of this usage occurs in Pliny.

(2) If the accusative which institutes the comparison is the object of a verb,

(a) In affirmative sentences where, in the earlier period, the comparative would be followed indifferently by *quam* with another accusative, or by the ablative, in Pliny the ablative is found, with one exception. (See IX, 29, 1, cited below.)

II, 17, 5: valvas aut fenestras non minores valvis habet.

III, 16, 2: multa referebat aviae suae non minora hoc sed obscuriora.

IV, 3, 4: Callimachum me vel Heroden vel si quid his melius tenere credebam.

IV, 14, 7: sed singula expendere nec deterius alio putare quod est in suo genere perfectum. Here *quam* would be the regular usage in Republican Literature because of the *quod* clause, but in Pliny this class, too, takes the ablative. (See Category VI, A.)

IV, 23, 3: *ipsae leges quae maiorem annis (LX)² otio reddunt.*

VI, 23, 1: *exigam enim mercedem honestiorem gratuito patrocinio.* (See Category VI, C.)

VIII, 11, 1: *cum adfectum tuum . . . cogito, etiam materna indulgentia molliorem.* (See Category VI, C.)

IX, 13, 26: *habes epistulam . . . libris quos legisti non minorem.* (See Category VI, A.)

Under this head, Neville states (p. 19) that Plautus is a law unto himself, in that in his work we find the accusative followed by *quam* and the nominative, sometimes with the form of the verb *sum* expressed. Pliny in the following sentence shows one instance which seems comparable to this usage: III, 5; 6: *scripsit 'Naturae historiarum triginta septem,' opus diffusum, eruditum, nec minus varium quam ipsa natura.* It is possible that the verb, which governs the title with which *opus* is in apposition, is so far removed from its object that its influence is not felt and for that reason *quam* is followed by the nominative.

On page 20, Neville notes the slight preponderance in this category of verbs of *considering or regarding*. His figures are not wholly clear, but in Pliny no such preponderance is found.

There is one example in the Letters where the comparative adjective with *est* understood has an infinitive as predicate, the accusatives which form the comparison being the objects of the infinitive.

IX, 29, 1: *ut satius unum aliquid insigniter facere quam plurima mediocriter.*

On page 16, Neville says, "There are some instances in which the comparative idea is found in an adjective to which the accusative with the infinitive is predicate." All the examples which he cites in illustration of this principle fulfill the required conditions except the following: Imp. Pomp. I, 3: *difficilius est exitum quam principium invenire*, in which the accusative instituting the comparison is not the subject of the infinitive but the object.

(b) In negative sentences in Republican Literature the comparative is usually followed by the ablative, unless the accusative which the comparative modifies is *neminem*,

² LX add. *Bipons*.

when the construction with *quam* is common. But in Pliny's Letters, the only negative example found in this category which includes *neminem* is in conformity with the general tendency of universal negatives (See Category XV.), including *nemo*, and is followed by the ablative.

IV, 17, 4: ille vir, quo neminem aetas nostra graviorem sanctiorem subtiliorem tulit. Under this heading, Neville cites eight instances (pp. 23, 24) of *neminem* followed by *quam* and the accusative, as against two instances with the ablative. To these two should be added the example, Phil. III, 12, 31: quo neminem sui similiorem. It is significant that, when the ablative does occur in these three cases, the word in the ablative is always a relative pronoun, while in the other examples, containing *quam* and an accusative, no relative pronouns occur. Pliny in the illustration quoted thus conforms to the actual practice of the Republican period.

Two of the following examples are used with *quam* in spite of the negative because of the fact that the second term of the comparison is absorbed into the relative pronoun.

II, 9, 4: Septicium, quo nihil verius, nihil simplicius, nihil candidius, nihil fidelius novi. •

III, 1, 1: nescio an ullum iucundius tempus exegerim quam quo nuper apud Spurinnam fui.

V, 16, 1: qua puella nihil umquam festivius, amabilius, nec modo longiore vita sed prope immortalitate dignius vidi.

VII, 18, 2: nihil commodius invenio quam quod ipse feci.

V.

The comparison is instituted with an ablative; *quam* and the ablative *always* follow. The comparative adjective is found in the nominative, accusative, and ablative.

The examples are grouped according to the types of ablative construction.

Means:

I, 20, 24: rectius tamen arbitror in tanta re ratione quam auctoritate superari.

II, 17, 15: hac non deteriore quam maris facie cenatio remota a mari fruitur. This is a condensed expression where *facie* must be supplied with *deteriore*. (See Category VI, B.)

IV, 11, 6: nec minore scelere quam quod ulcisci videbatur.

In this case the second term of the comparison has been absorbed into the relative pronoun.

Specification:

IX, 22, 3: pro hoc ego amico . . . non minus aeger animo, quam corpore ille. (See Category XIV, A.)

X, 41, 1: opera non minus aeternitate tua quam gloria digna.

Attendant Circumstance:

II, 11, 14: coepi dicere non minore audientium adsensu quam sollicitudine mea. (See Categories II, C; VI, B and C.)

Time:

VIII, 18, 1: cum Domitius Tullus longe melior apparuerit morte quam vita. (See Category XI.)

VI, 2, 6: quia paucioribus clepsydris praecipitamus causas quam diebus explicari solebant. (See Category I, A.)

Manner:

III, 7, 5: scribebat carmina maiore cura quam ingenio.

IV, 13, 4: ubi enim aut iucundius morarentur quam in patria . . . aut minore sumptu quam domi? In this case a locative forms the second part of the comparison instituted with the adverb *ubi*. (See Category XI.)

The use of *quam* in these first five categories, as Neville states (p. 25), seems capable of explanation on the ground of the necessity of avoiding ambiguity.

VI.

One or other of the nouns that form the terms of the comparison is modified.

A.

The modifier is a clause. Though *quam* is usually found in the examples of this type in Republican Literature, in Pliny the ablative *always* occurs.

(1) The clause modifies the second member. The ablative occurs in spite of the modifier.

IX, 13, 26: habes epistulam . . . libris quos legisti non minorem. (See Category IV, B, 2, \.)

X, 49, 1: ob hoc quod (aedes) est minus depressior opere eo quod cum maxime surgit. Here the ablative persists in spite of the fact that the comparative is modified by an ablative of degree of difference. (See Category X.)

(2) The clause modifies the first member. The ablative is used.

IV, 14, 7: *sed singula expendere nec deterius alio putare quod est in suo genere perfectum.* (See Category IV, B, 2, a.)
 IX, 26, 10: *sed vide quanto maior sit qui reprehenditur ipso reprehendente.* (See Categories X, XI.) In addition to the ablative of degree of difference and the clause, is the use of the present participle equivalent to a clause modifier of the second member.

B.

One or other of the elements of the comparison is modified by the genitive of a noun. Again, in the Republican Period *quam* follows in almost every example of the kind; in Pliny there are but three instances where *quam* occurs, as contrasted with five cases of the use of the ablative.

II, 11, 14: *coepi dicere non minore audientium adsensu quam sollicitudine mea.* (See Categories II, C; V; VI, C.)

II, 17, 15: *hac non deteriore quam maris facie cenatio remota a mari fruitur.* (See Category V.)

IX, 10, 3: *magisque laboribus ruris quam voluptatibus simile.* (See Categories III and IX.)

These three examples are the only ones found which take *quam* and the reason for the first two is, doubtless, the desire to avoid ambiguity, as in these cases the first term of the comparison is itself an ablative. In the third example the regular rules apply for the use of *quam* when the terms of the comparison are in the dative, (Category III), and when the adjective is compared with *magis*. (Category IX.)

The ablative follows the comparative; the genitive modifies the second element.

VI, 24, 5: *non quia minus (factum) illo clarissimo Arriae facto.* (See Category VI, C.)

VII, 27, 6: *longiorque causis timoris timor erat.*

The genitive modifies the first element.

V, 7, 2: *mihi autem defuncti voluntas antiquior iure est.*

V, 16, 6: *O morte ipsa mortis tempus indignius.* (See Category VI, C.)

VII, 27, 2: *offertur ei mulieris figura humana grandior pulchriorque.* (See Categories VIII, A; XIV, B.)

C.

One or other of the terms of the comparison is modified by an adjective or adjective phrase. In Pliny's Letters the abla-

tive *always* occurs. In the earlier literature the occurrence of the ablative is an exception, though admittedly a somewhat frequent exception, and is explained as such. Here the ablative is the rule.

I, 12, 11: *florente re publica, quae illi omnibus suis carior erat.* (See Categories VII, XIV.)

II, 11, 14: *coepti dicere non minore audientium adsensu quam sollicitudine mea.* (See Categories II, C; V; VI, B.)

III, 8, 2: *titulis . . . qui sunt omnibus honoribus pulchriores.* (See Category XIV, B.)

III, 16, 13: *videntur haec tibi maiora illo, 'Paete, non dolet'.* (See Category XIV, B.)

IV, 15, 6: *Asinius Bassus . . . iuvenis . . . ipso patre melior.* (See Category XIV, B.)

V, 16, 6: *O morte ipsa mortis tempus indignius.* (See Category VI, B.)

VI, 2, 6: *an nos sapientiores maioribus nostris, nos legibus ipsis iustiores?* (See Category XIV, B.)

VI, 16, 17: *nox omnibus noctibus nigrior densiorque.* (See Category XIV.)

VI, 23, 1: *exigam mercedem honestiorem gratuito patrocinio.* (See Category IV, B, 2, a.)

VI, 24, 5: *non quia minus (factum) illo clarissimo Arriae facto.* (See Category VI, B.)

VIII, 11, 1: *adfectum tuum . . . cogito, materna indulgentia molliorem.* (See Category IV, B, 2, a.)

IX, 33, 4: *hoc certamine puer quidam audentior ceteris.* (See Category XIV, B.) The comparison of the participle shows clearly that the word belongs to the period of Silver Latin.

X, 39, 6: *quod est omni pecunia pretiosius.* (See Category XIV, B.)

VII.

The comparative adjective is modified by a noun in the dative case. In Republican Literature but few instances occur and these are all followed by *quam* and the same case as precedes. In the Letters there is only one example and that takes the ablative.

I, 12, 11: *florente re publica, quae illi omnibus suis carior erat.* (See Categories VI, C; XIV, B.)

VIII.

A.

The comparison is instituted with a noun modified by an adjective and is followed in the second member by an adjective agreeing with the noun understood. In the Republican Period the *quam* construction is always found in this type. In the two examples found in Pliny the ablative is used.

V, 1, 1: legatum . . . modicum sed amplissimo gratius. Cur amplissimo gratius? (See Category XIV, B.)

VII, 27, 2: offertur ei mulieris figura humana grandior pulchriorque. Here the genitive *mulieris* is the equivalent of an adjective and *humana* agrees with the ablative of *figura* understood. (See Categories VI, B; XIV, B.)

B.

The comparison is instituted with an adjective; *quam* with another adjective follows in Pliny as well as in Republican Literature. In every case in Pliny the comparison is formed with *non* or *nec minus*. No such instances are cited for the Republican Period.

II, 2, 1: sed ego, tamquam non minus iusta quam magna sit, graviter irascor. (See Category XI.)

III, 1, 9: cena non minus nitida quam frugi.

III, 19, 2: quod non minus utile quam voluptuosum.

IV, 3, 2: condire . . . adjungere non minus difficile quam magnum est. Here the infinitives are the subjects of *est*.

VI, 22, 6: nec minus acer quam bonus et sincerus.

VII, 19, 7: non minus amabilis quam veneranda.

VIII, 23, 5: non minus iucundus et gratus quam utilis fuit.

In Republican Literature only nine examples are cited under this class; Pliny alone furnishes seven.

Most. 289, quoted here by Neville, belongs rather under A.

IX.

Adjectives compared with *magis* are followed by *quam* in Republican Literature except in the case of absolute negatives. Since there are no absolute negatives in this class in Pliny, *quam* always occurs, followed by the same case as precedes.

II, 17, 11: duae cellae magis elegantes quam sumptuosae.

III, 7, 9: delicato magis corpore quam infirmo. In both of

these cases adjectives form the terms of the comparison as in Category VIII, B.

IX, 10, 3: id genus operis inamabile, inamoenum magisque laboribus ruris quam voluptatibus simile. (See Categories III; VI, B.) The use of *magis* in forming the comparative of *similis* is exceedingly rare. Forcellini cites but one other example of this use: Amph. 2, 1, 54: Neque lac lacti magis est simile.

IX, 15, 1: quos aliquanto magis invitus quam meos lego. The use of the ablative of degree of difference and the fact that an adjective forms the second term of the comparison, as in Category VIII, A, may be causes which contribute to the employment of the *quam*. In addition, the real force of *magis invitus* is adverbial. (See Category XXII.)

X.

When the comparative adjective is modified by an ablative of degree of difference, the ablative of comparison is never used in Republican Literature, according to Neville's statement (p. 34), although (p. 36) he cites as exceptions to this general law three examples where the ablative is used. In Pliny, two examples agree with the more common Republican usage which takes *quam*.

III, 20, 10: nobis quanto rarior quam veteribus occasio tanto minus omittenda est. (See Category III.)

IV, 8, 5: ut consulatum multo etiam iuvenior quam ille sum consecutus. (See Category XIV, A.)

There are two examples which have the ablative in spite of the ablative of degree of difference. Both these citations, however, fall under Category VI, A, where one of the terms of the comparison is modified by a clause, a class which in Pliny *always* takes the ablative.

X, 49, 1: quod (aedes) est multo depressior opere eo quod cum maxime surgit. (See Category VI, A, 1.)

IX, 26, 10: sed vide quanto maior sit qui reprehenditur ipso reprehendente. (See Categories VI, A; XI.)

XI.

Cicero, according to Neville, exhibits an individual peculiarity in using *quam* where the verb for any reason whatever appears in the subjunctive mood, unless the verb occurs in a uni-

versal negative sentence. In this case the ablative generally appears. He notes several exceptions in Cicero, however, and also quotes one instance each from Plautus, Varro and Cato, of sentences containing a universal negative where *quam* and the subjunctive occur. That Cicero's usage is not wholly consistent can be seen by comparing (p. 23) Quinct. 3, 11: *natura nihil melius quam vocem dedisset* and (p. 21), C. 40: *nihil mente praestabilius dedisset*, where apparently the subjunctive influences one and not the other. To the exceptions noted on page 38, should be added T. IV, 57; Phil. XIII, 6, on page 20; and Cael. 27, 64 on page 30, where the ablative cannot be ascribed to the universal negative idea.

As far as the subjunctive in Pliny's Letters is concerned, it seems to have no influence whatever upon the construction. There are six cases where the ablative occurs when there is a subjunctive in the sentence against seven where *quam* is found. The instances where *quam* appears follow to show that the *quam* may be due in each of these cases to influences other than the subjunctive:

II, 2, 1: *sed ego, tamquam non minus iusta quam magna sit, graviter irascor.* (See Category VIII, B.) Adjectives form the terms of the comparison.

III, 1, 1: *nescio an ullum iucundius tempus exegerim quam quo nuper apud Spurinnam fui.* (See Category IV, B, 2, b.) The second term of the comparison is absorbed into the relative following.

IV, 13, 4: *ubi enim aut iucundius morarentur quam in patria . . . aut minore sumptu quam domi?* (See Category V.) An adverb and a locative are the terms of comparison.

V, 1, 9: *ut non amplius apud te quam quarta (pars) remaneret.* (See Category XXI—Amplius, B.)

VI, 11, 4: *peto ut omnis qui me imitari tanti putabunt meliores esse quam me velint.* (See Category IV, B, 1, a.) The accusative which institutes the comparison is the subject of an infinitive.

VII, 17, 5: *cur minus probabilis sit causa recitandi quam edendi?* (See Category II, A.) The terms of the comparison are genitives.

VIII, 18, 1: *cum Domitius Tullus longe melior apparuerit morte quam vita.* (See Category V.) The terms of the comparison are ablatives.

these cases adjectives form the terms of the comparison as in Category VIII, B.

IX, 10, 3: id genus operis inamabile, inamoenum magisque laboribus ruris quam voluptatibus simile. (See Categories III; VI, B.) The use of *magis* in forming the comparative of *similis* is exceedingly rare. Forcellini cites but one other example of this use: Amph. 2, 1, 54: Neque lac lacti magis est simile.

IX, 15, 1: quos aliquanto magis invitus quam meos lego. The use of the ablative of degree of difference and the fact that an adjective forms the second term of the comparison, as in Category VIII, A, may be causes which contribute to the employment of the *quam*. In addition, the real force of *magis invitus* is adverbial. (See Category XXII.)

X.

When the comparative adjective is modified by an ablative of degree of difference, the ablative of comparison is never used in Republican Literature, according to Neville's statement (p. 34), although (p. 36) he cites as exceptions to this general law three examples where the ablative is used. In Pliny, two examples agree with the more common Republican usage which takes *quam*.

III, 20, 10: nobis quanto rarior quam veteribus occasio tanto minus omittenda est. (See Category III.)

IV, 8, 5: ut consulatum multo etiam iuvenior quam ille sum consecutus. (See Category XIV, A.)

There are two examples which have the ablative in spite of the ablative of degree of difference. Both these citations, however, fall under Category VI, A, where one of the terms of the comparison is modified by a clause, a class which in Pliny *always* takes the ablative.

X, 49, 1: quod (aedes) est multo depressior opere eo quod cum maxime surgit. (See Category VI, A, 1.)

IX, 26, 10: sed vide quanto maior sit qui reprehenditur ipso reprehendente. (See Categories VI, A; XI.)

XI.

Cicero, according to Neville, exhibits an individual peculiarity in using *quam* where the verb for any reason whatever appears in the subjunctive mood, unless the verb occurs in a uni-

versal negative sentence. In this case the ablative generally appears. He notes several exceptions in Cicero, however, and also quotes one instance each from Plautus, Varro and Cato, of sentences containing a universal negative where *quam* and the subjunctive occur. That Cicero's usage is not wholly consistent can be seen by comparing (p. 23) Quint. 3, 11: *natura nihil melius quam vocem dedisset* and (p. 21), C. 40: *nihil mente praestabilius dedisset*, where apparently the subjunctive influences one and not the other. To the exceptions noted on page 38, should be added T. IV, 57; Phil. XIII, 6, on page 20; and Cael. 27, 64 on page 30, where the ablative cannot be ascribed to the universal negative idea.

As far as the subjunctive in Pliny's Letters is concerned, it seems to have no influence whatever upon the construction. There are six cases where the ablative occurs when there is a subjunctive in the sentence against seven where *quam* is found. The instances where *quam* appears follow to show that the *quam* may be due in each of these cases to influences other than the subjunctive:

II, 2, 1: *sed ego, tamquam non minus iusta quam magna sit, graviter irascor.* (See Category VIII, B.) Adjectives form the terms of the comparison.

III, 1, 1: *nescio an ullum iucundius tempus exegerim quam quo nuper apud Spurinnam fui.* (See Category IV, B, 2, b.) The second term of the comparison is absorbed into the relative following.

IV, 13, 4: *ubi enim aut iucundius morarentur quam in patria . . . aut minore sumptu quam domi?* (See Category V.) An adverb and a locative are the terms of comparison.

V, 1, 9: *ut non amplius apud te quam quarta (pars) remaneret.* (See Category XXI—Amplius, B.)

VI, 11, 4: *peto ut omnis qui me imitari tanti putabunt meliores esse quam me velint.* (See Category IV, B, 1, a.) The accusative which institutes the comparison is the subject of an infinitive.

VII, 17, 5: *cur minus probabilis sit causa recitandi quam edendi?* (See Category II, A.) The terms of the comparison are genitives.

VIII, 18, 1: *cum Domitius Tullus longe melior apparuerit morte quam vita.* (See Category V.) The terms of the comparison are ablatives.

Hence we may conclude that the subjunctive in Pliny does not cause the employment of *quam* after the comparative.

XII.

Here Neville places a usage peculiar to Publilius Syrus in Republican Literature, in which an infinitive stands as the real subject of the verb and a comparative adjective is the predicate modifier of the infinitive. The comparative is followed by *quam* and a noun in the nominative. The following (Neville, p. 38) is a citation from Publilius Syrus, showing the type of construction: 501: plus est quam poena iniuriæ succumbere.

There is but one example in Pliny at all comparable to this, and that is open to a double interpretation. The whole sentence is quoted for the sake of clearness.

III, 16, 6: sed tamen ista facienti, ista dicenti gloria et aeternitas ante oculos erant; quo maius est sine praemio aeternitatis, sine praemio gloriae abdere lacrimas, operire luctum, amissoque filio matrem adhuc agere. Here, if *quo* is taken as a relative pronoun having as its antecedent *facere* and *dicere*, inferred from *ista facienti* and *ista dicenti* in the first part of the sentence, we have a similar usage except that the ablative is found after the comparative in place of *quam*. (See Category XV.) If, on the other hand, we regard *quo* as an ablative of degree of difference, Pliny then shows no parallel to the usage of Publilius Syrus.

XIII.

The genitive of price in Republican Literature when expressed by a comparative is followed, with but one exception, by the *quam* construction. Pliny has but one instance where both terms of the comparison are expressed, and *quam* is used.

VIII, 2, 4: qui pluris quam decem milibus emerant. (See Category XXI, Plus, B.) This example is not exactly comparable to those cited by Neville, as the second member does not express something whose *value* is compared with the value of the first member, but the comparison lies rather between the two expressions of price; the one genitive, the other ablative.

XIV.

The noun or pronoun with which the comparison is instituted is in the nominative and the comparative adjective agrees with it. In Republican Literature either the ablative or *quam*

follows; if *quam*, the second term of the comparison is expressed by the nominative. In Pliny, the ablative is the more common construction. Under this heading there are cited twenty-five examples, of which nine have already been given in Category VI, C, which in Pliny always takes the ablative, and three in Category VI, B and two in Category VIII, A in which the ablative regularly occurs. This explains the apparently large proportion of ablatives in this category in Pliny.

A.

Quam with the nominative.

IV, 8, 5: consulatum multo iuvenior quam ille sum consecutus. (See Category X.)

VIII, 24, 6: longeque valentior amor ad optinendum quod velis quam timor.

IX, 22, 3: pro hoc ego amico . . . non minus aeger animo quam corpore ille. (See Category V.)

III, 21, 6: quid homini potest dari maius quam gloria et laus et aeternitas? This is an exception to Category XVI and the only instance where an exception is in favor of *quam*.

III, 4, 9: mihi aequae iucunda erit simplicitas dissentientis quam conprobantis auctoritas. The *aequae iucunda* here is equivalent to *non minus iucunda*. *Aequae ac* would have been much more common in the Republican Period; *aeque quam*, according to the Thesaurus, occurring rarely, except in Plautus and prose writers from the Augustan Period on.

B.

The ablative appears after the comparative.

I, 5, 15: timetur a pluribus, quod plerumque fortius amore est.

I, 12, 11: florente re publica, quae illi omnibus suis carior erat. (See Categories VI, C; VII.)

III, 1, 5: aut sermo libro potior.

III, 8, 2: titulis . . . qui sunt omnibus honoribus pulchriores. (See Category VI, C.)

III, 16, 13: videnturne haec tibi maiora illo, 'Paete, non dolet'. (See Category VI, C.)

IV, 15, 6: Asinius Bassus, iuvenis . . . ipso patre melior. (See Category VI, C.)

IV, 25, 5: ubique vitia remediis fortiora.

V, 1, 1: legatum . . . modicum sed amplissimo gratius. (See Category VIII, A.)

V, 7, 2: mihi autem defuncti voluntas antiquior iure est. (See Category VI, B.)

VI, 2, 6: an nos sapientiores maioribus nostris, nos legibus ipsis iustiores? (See Category VI, C.)

VI, 16, 17: illic nox omnibus noctibus nigrior densiorque. (See Category VI, C.)

VI, 20, 9: fulguribus illae et similes et maiores erant. Here *fulguribus* may serve a double function with *similes* and *maiores*.

VI, 24, 5: factum . . . non quia minus illo clarissimo Arriae facto sed quia minor ipsa. (See Categories VI, B and C.)

VII, 27, 2: offertur ei mulieris figura humana grandior pulchriorque. (See Categories VI, B; VIII, A.)

VIII, 20, 4: color caerulo albidior, viridior et pressior.

IX, 6, 3: apud vulgus, quod vilis tunica.

IX, 26, 9: quid haec, breviora superioribus sed audacia paria?

IX, 33, 4: puer quidam audentior ceteris. (See Category VI, C.)

X, 39, 6: quod est omni pecunia pretiosius. (See Category VI, C.)

X, 41, 3: exploret sitne lacus altior mari. (See Category XI.)

From this Category the following list of adjectives is collected, which lend additional support to Neville's refutation of Landgraf's theory (p. 42), "that apart from certain well-defined general categories (e.g., negatives, interrogatives equivalent to a negative, and proverbial phrases) the adjectives *antiquior*, *interior*, and *posterior* alone are followed by the ablative." The adjectives are starred which are also found in Neville's list: fortior, potior,* vilis, brevior. The examples in which these words occur belong under no other categories; in all the other illustrations the ablative might be explained on other grounds.

XV.

Sentences in which there is a universal negative usually have the ablative in the Republican Period, where the comparative adjective agrees with the nominative that constitutes the first term of the comparison. In Pliny there is but one exception to the use of the ablative in this Category, and that occurs in a

construction for which no parallel is cited in Republican Literature. (See IX, 37, 3, cited below.)

The rule which is found in some grammars stating that the relative pronoun never has the *quam* construction after the comparative is considered unnecessary by Neville (page 43) on the ground that all the examples which can be cited to prove this rule come under the class of universal negatives, where the ablative is the regular construction. The only example found in Pliny which has an ablative of a relative pronoun, and has not a universal negative is: III, 16, 6: quo maius est . . . abdere lacrimas, operire luctum . . . matrem agere, cited under Category XII. Although this, without supporting examples, would not be enough to challenge the theory that the universal negative can account for all occurrences of the ablative of the relative after the comparative, it at least suggests an exception. Such a possibility is, however, eliminated if the *quo* is given the interpretation suggested under Category XII; viz., an ablative of degree of difference.

I, 22, 1: nihil est enim illo gravius, sanctius, doctius.

II, 3, 5: quo genere hominum nihil aut sincerius aut simplicius aut melius.

II, 3, 8: cognitionem, qua nulla est iucundior, nulla pulchrior, nulla denique humanior.

III, 1, 1: nihil est enim illo vitae genere distinctius.

IV, 2, 8: quo mendacius nihil est.

IV, 22, 3: Junius Mauricus quo viro nihil firmitus, nihil verius.

VI, 26, 2: generum quo melior fingi ne voto quidem potuit. Here the *ne—quidem* has the force of an absolute negative.

IX, 5, 3: nihil est ipsa aequalitate inaequalius. (See Category XVIII.)

IX, 32: nihil est enim aut pigrius delicatis aut curiosus otiosis.

Three examples of the nine quoted above employ a *nihil* referring to a person, a usage common in Cicero's Letters.

In the following reference the *quam* is used in spite of the presence of the absolute negative, due to the fact that the second member of the comparison is absorbed into the relative pronoun.

IX, 37, 3: nullum iustius genus reditus quam quod terra caelum annus refert.

XVI.

When the absolute negative idea is expressed in the form of a rhetorical question, the ablative usually follows the comparative, both in Republican Literature and in Pliny.

I, 5, 1: vidistine quemquam M. Regulo timidiorem humi-
liorem post Domitiani mortem?

II, 13, 6: quid enim illo aut fidelius amico aut sodale iucun-
dus? In this example *amico* and *sodale* seem to be predicate
appositives. On page 41, Neville cites: F. IV. 10: ars
tamen est dux certior quam natura, and adds the statement
that the form of this sentence is unparalleled having a predi-
cate appositive in a comparative sentence. In this example
from Pliny, and in VI:17, 5, quoted below, we have illus-
trations of predicate appositives in rhetorical questions, the
comparative followed by the ablative in place of *quam*,
which may be due to the fact that both are rhetorical ques-
tions in form.

III, 21, 6: quid homini potest dari maius quam gloria et laus
et aeternitas? This is the only exception to this category for
which there seems no plausible explanation. Moreover, in
Pliny when the nominative has the comparative adjective in
agreement, the ablative usually follows. (See Category
XIV.)

V, 14, 3: Cornuto autem quid melius, quid sanctius, quid in
omni genere laudis expressius?

VI, 17, 5: quamquam quis uno te reverentior huius operis,
quis benignior aestimator? (See note on II, 13, 6, above.)

VI, 18, 2: quid enim precibus aut honestius piis aut effica-
cius amantis?

VII, 28, 2: quid enim honestius culpa benignitatis?

VIII, 24, 7: nam quid ordinatione civilis, quid libertate
pretiosius?

IX, 26, 9: quid audentius illo pulcherrimo excessu?

In seven of these citations, no verb is expressed.

II, 3, 6: nam quid in senectute felicius quam quod dulcissi-
mum est in iuventa? The *quam* is used in this example
because of the fact that the second term is absorbed into
the relative pronoun.

In this category Neville states that for Republican Litera-
ture very nearly 95% of the examples quoted have the ablative
after the comparative. In Pliny, eight out of ten have the abla-

tive, and of the remaining two which take *quam*, one is capable of explanation. In five out of eight examples, the ablative stands before the comparative, the regular position, as shown by the citations from Republican writings. As in Category XV, the neuter is likewise found here, referring to persons.

XVII.

It is sometimes desirable to sum up a following infinitive (Neville, p. 58) or other modal construction that takes *quam* by a neuter pronoun; this pronoun is with one exception put in the ablative after the comparative. This is a construction which seems to have been employed by Cicero only; Pliny offers nothing parallel to it.

XVIII.

Proverbial expressions.

From Republican Literature over fifty examples have been collected of proverbial expressions, Catullus being especially well represented in this category. It might be expected that, since the references in this paper are drawn from letters, many phrases of the *luce clarior, vita dulcior* type would be used. But, as a matter of fact, Pliny's Letters lack that very quality of spontaneity which would make such colloquial phrases common in Cicero's Letters.

But one example of this kind is found in Pliny:

IX, 5, 3: nihil est ipsa aequalitate inaequalius. (See Category XV.)

XIX.

In the works of Lucretius, Varro, and Cicero are found twenty-eight examples of "*alius*, as subject of a comparative clause," and referring "to a preceding *alius* as subject of the first term of comparison." (Neville, p. 66.) The ablative occurs after the comparative. No example of this usage is found in Pliny.

XX.

In the literature of the Republican Period are found *opinionem, spe, expectationem, voluntate, aequo, iusto, necessario*, forming the second term of a comparison, in the sense of "more, less, greater than you expected" (p. 67). In Pliny none of these particular words occurs, but there is one example in which the ablative of the perfect passive participle *solito* is found, used substantively. This same word occurs in like construction in

Ovid: 4 Art. Am. 411: blandior solito; 5 Fast. 547: citius solito; 15 Heroid. 47: plus solito; in Livy, 25, 7: visus sol rubere solito magis; and in Val. Flacc. 7, 66: solito superbior. (Forcellini.)

II, 14, 14: sumus tamen solito rariores.

A usage is found in Pliny which seems to take the place of the freer construction just mentioned, and is another indication of the tendency in Pliny to use a more stilted phraseology.

I, 13, 16: his ex causis longius quam destinaveram tempus in urbe consumpsi.

IX, 20, 2: vindemias . . . uberiores tamen quam expectaveram colligo.

X, 17, 2: contrariis ventis retentus tardius quam speraveram . . . intravi. In this example the adjective is replaced by the adverb *tardius*. (See Category XXII.)

XXI.

Construction with *plus*, *minus*, *amplius*, *longius*, when combined with numerals.

Plus

A.

Followed by the ablative. No examples are found in Pliny.

B.

Followed by *quam*.

VIII, 2, 4: qui pluris quam decem milibus emerant. (See Category XIII.)

C.

Without influence upon the construction. No examples are found in Pliny under this heading.

Amplius

A.

Followed by the ablative.

X, 90, 1: est ab capite paulo amplius mille passibus locus suspectus et mollis. It is impossible to determine in this case whether the ablative is due to the comparative or whether it is an ablative of degree of difference.

B.

Followed by *quam*.

V, 1, 9: ut non amplius apud te quam quarta (pars) remaneret. (See Category XI.)

C.

Without influence upon the construction.

III, 5, 12: decem amplius versus perdidimus.

V, 7, 3: huic quadringentorum milium paulo amplius tertiam partem denegem?

The following reference cannot show the construction because the numeral is indeclinable:

X, 39, 1: sestertium amplius centies hausit.

Minus

A.

Followed by the ablative.

VII, 24, 1: paulo minus octogensimo aetatis anno decessit.

With other forms, as *minores*, and *minoribus*:

X, 79, 4: qui minores triginta annis.

X, 79, 4: minoribus annis triginta permisisset. (See Category XI.) Here it might be expected that after the dative form *minoribus* the *quam* construction would be used to avoid ambiguity.

No other examples are found representing the construction after *minus*.

For the sake of clearness the results of this classification may be summarized in the following table:

	Ablative	Quam	No Influence	Doubtful	Total
plus.....	0	1	0	0	1
amplius.....	0	1	2	2	5
minus.....	3	0	0	0	3
	—	—	—	—	—
	3	2	2	2	9

On page 71, Neville states a theory to account for the fact that *plus*, and the other words which belong to the same class, do not influence the construction of the words which follow them. He states that if, as he proves on page 70, the ablative following *plus* is, without question, not an ablative of duration of time, but clearly an ablative of comparison, "we are forced to search for some other explanation than the usually accepted doctrine of parataxis for the sentence where *plus* has no influence on the construction." In addition he asserts that the ablative, since it was the earliest comparative construction, would be the form that would be used almost entirely with

numerals in the early period. Many cases would occur in the spoken language where the noun would be omitted and the comparative would be followed by the numeral alone, which, being indeclinable, could not indicate the case form. Frequent repetition of such a usage would in time remove the feeling that an ablative should occur, and thus would gradually develop the construction where the noun would appear in company with the numeral, but the case would be unaffected by the presence of the comparative. Such is Neville's hypothesis.

But it does not seem necessary to abolish what he refers to as the "accepted doctrine of parataxis" to explain the instances where *quam* does not influence the case which follows, even if we admit that the ablative which occurs after *plus* is essentially a comparative-ablative. If we are to extend the scope of the word parataxis, as Neville apparently does, to comprehend all subordinate relations whether expressed by verbs or substantives, might not the sentences of the types, "twenty cities, (aye) more were fired," (Bennett, *Lat. Lang.* p. 199) and "X has more than a hundred books," (Neville, p. 71) be considered as successive developments, the first paratactic, and the second hypotactic? A number of instances of the paratactic order still survive, some of them from the earliest extant literature. Enn. Ann. 501; Cato, Agr. 150, 2; 49, 1: (Bennett's *Syntax of Early Latin*; Vol. II); Cicero, Flacc. 26, 63: (Neville, p. 75); Tac. Ann. XII, 43; Livy XXIX, 32, 5: (Bennett's *Latin Language*, p. 199).

Since, therefore, the two usages exist side by side throughout the Literature, it seems not at all improbable that whether synchronous in origin, or representing successive phases of development, both may have established themselves in the language before the literary period and left their traces on subsequent usages.

XXII.

General Adverbs.

The statement that, with very few exceptions, comparative adverbs are followed by *quam* in Republican Literature is equally true for Silver Latin as represented in Pliny's Letters, with one doubtful exception, VII, 28, 2: where the manuscript reads: *qui sunt tamen isti qui amicos meos melius norint?*, but where Bipons, Mommsen and Müller very plausibly conjecture "*meos me melius norint*".

The adverbs are arranged in order of frequency of occurrence and the place is cited where the reference is found.

Magis

Magis occurs twenty-four times, fourteen times with negatives, and four times in the sense of *potius*:

With negatives: I, 6, 3; I, 20, 3; I, 20, 5; II, 4, 2; II, 6, 7; III, 13, 4; V, 17, 3; VI, 3, 2; VI, 16, 5; VI, 27, 3; VII, 24, 5; VIII, 14, 17; VIII, 22, 1; IX, 26, 3.

With the sense of *potius*: I, 8, 13; IV, 7, 7; IV, 9, 12; VI, 29, 5.

Other uses: II, 1, 10; III, 9, 33; IV, 12, 7; VII, 6, 7; VIII, 14, 7; IX, 15, 1.

Minus

Minus occurs five times, always accompanied by a negative: I, 20, 20; II, 10, 4; 7; IV, 10, 3; V, 6, 18.

Potius

Potius occurs three times:

II, 19, 6; III, 18, 10; IX, 29, 2.

Saepius

Saepius occurs twice:

III, 20, 6; VII, 29, 3.

Each of the following occurs but once, and those are starred which do not occur in the list for Republican Literature (Neville, page 83).

ardentius,* VIII, 10, 3; diligentius, VII, 18, 5; frequentius,* V, 6, 5; intentius,* 1, 4, 2; melius, I, 21, 2; patientius,* VII, 20, 1; plus, II, 20, 6; rectius, II, 6, 5; religiosius,* III, 7, 8; sollicitius,* I, 4, 2; tardius,* X, 17, 2.

On page 84, Neville notes further a few examples of positives followed by the ablative, beginning with Plautus and represented by Cicero. No such usage has been noted for Pliny, but two cases of *alius* followed by *quam* are cited:

II, 4, 1: si pluribus pater tuus vel uni cuilibet alii quam mihi debuisset.

X, 96, 8: nihil aliud inveni quam superstitionem pravam.

Here, too, might be noted the use of *aeque ut* (Compare also

III, 4, 9, cited under Category XIV, A.) in place of the usual *aeque ac*:

I, 20, 1: cui nihil aequae in causis agendis ut brevitatis placet.

One example occurs where *secus* is followed by *quam* in place of *ac*, as against two instances where *ac* occurs:

III, 19, 8: cuius arca non secus ac mea utor.

IV, 22, 5: quo . . . non secus ac tela . . . contorquebatur

V, 6, 39: non secus ibi quam in nemore.

Perinde ac also occurs in the sense of *aeque ac*:

VI, 1, 1: desiderium absentium nihil perinde ac vicinitas acuit.

IX, 20, 1: cum omnia nostra perinde ac nos ames.

From Plautus on, down through the Literature, rare examples are found of the genitive used after a comparative, a use which the jurists seem first to have popularized. (Schmalz: Lat. Gram. Syntax, Vol. II, p. 385, note 1.) The particular form of the construction used by Pliny is found in the phrase *minor triginta annorum*, which, according to Schmalz, (p. 363, note 4), was in use from the time of Varro. The usage Schmalz explains as being developed by analogy from such an expression as *cum esset annorum decem*, when he was ten years old, where *annorum decem* is a genitive of quality. He adds that the genitive *annorum* is common in phrases like *natus decem annorum*, which, according to Konjetzny (Arch. XV. 314), is a development by contamination of such constructions as *natus annos* and *fuit annorum*.

Priscian, (Gram. III, 175, 5), states: *similiter dicitur minor viginti annorum* ἡττων τοῦ τῶν εἰκοσι ἐτῶν, younger than one of twenty years, and Draeger (Syntax der Lateinischen Sprache, Vol. I, p. 566, 4) calls this usage the Greek genitive with the comparative, although he suggests, (p. 494), that the *quam* may be understood with such phrases as these in question. Hence, from all these explanations, it is apparent that in phrases like *minor triginta annorum*, the genitive is an original genitive of quality unaffected by the presence of the comparative.

It is interesting to note that the genitive and the ablative are both used in the same Letter after the comparative, as though from frequency of use the constructions had become interchangeable, and that possibly due to Greek influence, the genitive was developing side by side with the ablative into a common construction dependent upon the comparative.

This parallel development may have been assisted by the growing lack of differentiation between the original uses of the genitive and ablative of quality.

There is one instance of this usage in Livy:

Livy XXXVIII, 38, 15: *minores octonum demum annorum*.

In Pliny the following examples occur:

X, 79, 1, *minor annorum triginta*

X, 79, 3, *minor triginta annorum*

X, 79, 4, *minores triginta annis*

X, 79, 4, *minoribus annis triginta*

X, 80, *minores duorum et viginti annorum*

X, 80, *minores triginta annorum*.

On page 78, Neville quotes an example from Varro, among those in which the construction is not influenced by *minus*: R. R. II, 7, 1: *minores trimae, maiores decem annorum*, where the *decem annorum*, according to Schmalz, is one of the earliest uses of this particular type of the genitive after the comparative.

CONCLUSIONS

In order to show as clearly as possible where the constructions in Pliny's Letters differ from those of the Republican Period, the same arrangement of categories is used in summing up the results of the investigation as that employed by Neville.

I. *Quam* always occurs in Republican Literature when the comparative adjective is not in agreement with a nominative or an accusative as the first term of the comparison, with one exception. See Neville, p. 13, Aul. 810.

Pliny agrees entirely with the usage of the earlier period.

II. *Quam* regularly occurs in Republican Literature.

a) When the second term of the comparison is modified by a clause.

Two examples are found in Pliny, having a clause modifier of the second term, and both have the *ablative*. Two instances also occur where the clause modifies the first term and here likewise the *ablative* is found.

b) When either term is modified by a genitive of a noun, or of a pronoun, or by an adjective.

There are nineteen examples in Pliny, which, with the exception of three, take the *ablative*.

c) When the comparative adjective is modified by an ablative of degree of difference or by a dative.

In the case of the first of these conditions, fifty per cent. of the examples in Pliny are in agreement with the Republican usage. The second class where the comparative word is modified by a dative is represented in Pliny by one example only, in which the *ablative* rather than the *quam*-construction is found.

d) When the comparative is formed by *magis*.

Pliny offers four examples which agree exactly with the above statement.

e) When the comparative agrees with an accusative used as subject of an infinitive in a positive sentence.

Here again Pliny follows the rule in the two examples which belong to this category.

f) When the comparative is an adverb excepting *plus*, *amplius*, *minus*, or *longius* with numerical expressions.

The adverbs in Pliny follow this rule with but one doubtful exception. (See Category XXII: Epist. VII, 28, 2.)

III. *Quam* or the *ablative* is used *indifferently* in Republican Literature.

a) When the comparative agrees with an accusative, the object of the verb in a positive sentence.

Pliny has nine examples, eight of which take the *ablative*.

b) Where the adjective agrees with the first term in the nominative.

In Pliny are found twenty-five examples, of which twenty are used with the *ablative*. Of these twenty, seventeen are cited under categories, which in the Republican Period would regularly require *quam*.

IV. The *ablative* is used *regularly* in the Republican Period in,

a) Universal negatives, whether of the nominative or accusative type.

Eleven examples of the nominative type are found in Pliny, all following the rule with one exception, which is capable of explanation. (See Category XV: Epist. IX, 37, 3.)

Three examples occur of the accusative type. In one of these, one term of the comparison is *neminem*, which is followed by the relative pronoun in the *ablative*, according to Republican usage; one takes *quam* because the second member of the comparison is absorbed into the relative pronoun which follows.

b) Rhetorical questions.

Ten examples are recorded for Pliny, eight with the *ablative*, and two with *quam*, one of which can be satisfactorily accounted for.

c) Proverbial expressions.

Pliny has but a single example, which conforms to the Republican usage.

V. The *ablative* is *always* used in the Republican Period in the expressions:

a) *alius alio*.

No examples are found in Pliny.

b) *opinione*, *spe*, *expectatione*, *aequo*, *iusto*.

One instance of this type is found in Pliny with *solito*.

CONCLUSIONS

In order to show as clearly as possible where the constructions in Pliny's Letters differ from those of the Republican Period, the same arrangement of categories is used in summing up the results of the investigation as that employed by Neville.

I. *Quam always* occurs in Republican Literature when the comparative adjective is not in agreement with a nominative or an accusative as the first term of the comparison, with one exception. See Neville, p. 13, Aul. 810.

Pliny agrees entirely with the usage of the earlier period.

II. *Quam regularly* occurs in Republican Literature.

a) When the second term of the comparison is modified by a clause.

Two examples are found in Pliny, having a clause modifier of the second term, and both have the *ablative*. Two instances also occur where the clause modifies the first term and here likewise the *ablative* is found.

b) When either term is modified by a genitive of a noun, or of a pronoun, or by an adjective.

There are nineteen examples in Pliny, which, with the exception of three, take the *ablative*.

c) When the comparative adjective is modified by an ablative of degree of difference or by a dative.

In the case of the first of these conditions, fifty per cent. of the examples in Pliny are in agreement with the Republican usage. The second class where the comparative word is modified by a dative is represented in Pliny by one example only, in which the ablative rather than the *quam*-construction is found.

d) When the comparative is formed by *magis*.

Pliny offers four examples which agree exactly with the above statement.

e) When the comparative agrees with an accusative used as subject of an infinitive in a positive sentence.

Here again Pliny follows the rule in the two examples which belong to this category.

f) When the comparative is an adverb excepting *plus*, *amplius*, *minus*, or *longius* with numerical expressions.

The adverbs in Pliny follow this rule with but one doubtful exception. (See Category XXII: Epist. VII, 28, 2.)

III. *Quam* or the *ablative* is used *indifferently* in Republican Literature.

a) When the comparative agrees with an accusative, the object of the verb in a positive sentence.

Pliny has nine examples, eight of which take the *ablative*.

b) Where the adjective agrees with the first term in the nominative.

In Pliny are found twenty-five examples, of which twenty are used with the *ablative*. Of these twenty, seventeen are cited under categories, which in the Republican Period would regularly require *quam*.

IV. The *ablative* is used *regularly* in the Republican Period in,

a) Universal negatives, whether of the nominative or accusative type.

Eleven examples of the nominative type are found in Pliny, all following the rule with one exception, which is capable of explanation. (See Category XV: Epist. IX, 37, 3.)

Three examples occur of the accusative type. In one of these, one term of the comparison is *neminem*, which is followed by the relative pronoun in the *ablative*, according to Republican usage; one takes *quam* because the second member of the comparison is absorbed into the relative pronoun which follows.

b) Rhetorical questions.

Ten examples are recorded for Pliny, eight with the *ablative*, and two with *quam*, one of which can be satisfactorily accounted for.

c) Proverbial expressions.

Pliny has but a single example, which conforms to the Republican usage.

V. The *ablative* is *always* used in the Republican Period in the expressions:

a) *alius alio*.

No examples are found in Pliny.

b) *opinione*, *spe*, *expectatione*, *aequo*, *iusto*.

One instance of this type is found in Pliny with *solito*.

